

CAI
XC 2
- 1959
B65

Government
Publications

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-fourth Parliament

1959

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON
BROADCASTING

Chairman: G. E. HALPENNY, Esq.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 11

THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 1959

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

WITNESSES:

E. L. Bushnell, Acting President, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation;
C. Jennings, Controller of Broadcasting and M. Ouimet, Deputy Con-
troller of Broadcasting.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1959

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON BROADCASTING

Chairman: G. E. Halpenny, Esq.,

Vice-Chairman: J. Flynn, Esq.,

and Messrs.

Miss Aitken,
R. A. Bell (*Carleton*),
Tom Bell (*Saint John-
Albert*),
Brassard (*Lapointe*),
Mrs. Casselman,
Chambers,
Dorion,
Eudes,
Fairfield,
Fisher,
Forgie,

Fortin,
Johnson,
Jung,
Kucherepa,
Lambert,
Macquarrie,
Mitchell,
Morris,
Muir (*Lisgar*),
McCleave,
McGrath,
McIntosh,

McQuillan,
Nowlan,
Pickersgill,
Pratt,
Richard (*Ottawa East*),
Robichaud,
Simpson,
Smith (*Calgary South*),
Smith (*Simcoe North*),
Tremblay.

J. E. O'Connor,
Clerk of the Committee.

CA1
XC 2
- 1959
B65

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, June 11, 1959.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met at 9.40 a.m. this day. The Vice-Chairman, Mr. Flynn, presided.

Members present: Miss Aitken, Messrs. Bell (*Saint John-Albert*), Fairfield, Fisher, Flynn, Johnson, Macquarrie, Morris, McCleave, McGrath, Paul, Smith (*Calgary South*), Smith (*Simcoe North*) and Tremblay—(14).

In attendance: Mr. E. L. Bushnell, Acting President of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, assisted by Messrs. R. L. Dunsmore, Chairman, Finance Committee, Board of Directors; J. P. Gilmore, Controller of Operations; Marcel Carter, Controller of Management Planning and Development; Charles Jennings, Controller of Broadcasting; Marcel Ouimet, Deputy Controller of Broadcasting; R. C. Fraser, Director of Public Relations; R. E. Keddy, Director of Organization; J. J. Trainor, Assistant to Director of Audience Research; Barry MacDonald, Secretary, Board of Directors; and J. A. Halbert, Assistant Secretary, Board of Directors.

The Vice-Chairman observed the presence of quorum and read to the Committee answers to questions asked at a previous meeting.

Agreed,—That item “2” of part “A” of the Agenda “Analysis of Costs” be transferred to part “D”, the heading relating to “Finance”.


Messrs. Jennings and Ouimet answered questions concerning the recruitment of new talent.

Agreed,—That item 9 of part “A” of the Agenda, “Relationship with performers Rights Society,” stand until printed copies of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of Tuesday, June 9, are received.

Mr. Jennings, dealing with item A-3 outlined the principles upon which a balance of programming is achieved. Messrs. Jennings, Ouimet and Bushnell were questioned concerning the percentages of westerns, dramas, educational programs, etc. appearing on television and broadcast by radio.

At 11.00 a.m. the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

J. E. O'Connor,
Clerk of the Committee.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761116497157>

NOTE: *Text of the Proceedings recorded in the French language appears immediately following this day's Evidence.*

REMARQUE: *Le texte des témoignages recueillis en français figure immédiatement à la suite du compte rendu des délibérations de la séance d'aujourd'hui.*

EVIDENCE

THURSDAY, June 11, 1959.
9:30 a.m.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN (*Mr. Flynn*): Miss Aitken and gentlemen, we have a quorum.

Before we proceed with the agenda, I would like to read a letter from Mr. MacDonald, secretary of the board of directors of the C.B.C., giving some answers to some of the questions raised in committee at the last meeting. It reads:

OTTAWA, June 11, 1959.

Mr. J. E. O'CONNOR,
Clerk,
Special Committee on Broadcasting,
Room 174, West Block,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. O'Connor:

Herewith are answers to some of the questions raised in Committee at the June 9 session.

Mr. McCleave asked whether husband and wife were ever on the same program when one was producer and the other an artist. The answer is that this has happened from time to time, though the incidence would be low in relation to our total broadcasting.

Mr. McIntosh asked how many performers were making more money than the Prime Minister. The answer is none.

Mr. Taylor asked if costumes for television were stored at the Georgia Street premises of the corporation in Vancouver. The answer is yes because of the proximity to performers and production staff.

Mr. Johnson enquired whether the wig maker in Montreal who sold his productions to the corporation was still a member of staff. The answer is no.

Mr. Tremblay asked concerning the program "Pour Elle". This weekly program on film is obtained and supplied by the sponsor's advertising agency. Consequently the CBC is not in a position to answer the questions raised concerning details and costs of production.

Yours sincerely,

BARRY MacDONALD,
Secretary—Board of Directors

Mr. TREMBLAY: That is very easy.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could suggest, as I did to you personally a minute ago, that we make a small change in our order of procedure. I understand that the analyses of costs under the heading of programming, item 2, are not yet ready.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I was going to suggest that it might be more useful to transfer this item to that under the heading D, "Finance", as it deals with income and we can deal with all general expenditures and costs at that time.

Again, it occurs to me we are localizing costs under expenditures, and the information is not ready yet, in any event, as I understand.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: If this suggestion is agreeable to the committee, I have no objection myself, because the information is not yet available.

It all depends on whether it is going to be available when we reach the item "Finance".

Mr. McCLEAVE: Agreed.

Agreed.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Mr. Tremblay?

Mr. TREMBLAY (*Interpretation*): Mr. Chairman, let me say, here and now, that I am not surprised that I have not received these details which I asked for regarding the program *Pour Elle*, but I nonetheless consider it would have been desirable to have those details.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: If the C.B.C. has not this information, we might try to obtain it elsewhere.

Mr. McCLEAVE: Mr. Chairman, in regard to the information that was given me, could it be found out whether this applies to any of these regular programs, ones on a week to week basis—I am not think of one performance only, but a regular series of programs. Could that be done?

Mr. ERNEST BUSHNELL (*Vice-President of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation*): Yes, I only just add the thought, Mr. McCleave, that occasionally it happens that a performer falls in love with a producer, and a producer with a performer, and they get married. They are both under contract; and there is not much we can do about that.

Mr. McCLEAVE: I recognize there are always dangers like that, whenever men and women are drawn together. I was going to ask the information be confined to cases where the marriage had taken place before the production?

Mr. BUSHNELL: Thank you. I do not think we can answer your question now, Mr. McCleave. I do not know of any such cases, where production has taken place before marriage.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: On the same subject Mr. McGrath?

Mr. McGRATH: Mr. Chairman, under item No. 4, I asked a series of questions at the last hearing with regard to two specific programs that had been produced by the corporation—the programs *Radisson* and the *Last of the Mohicans*. I understand both these programs were sold in the United States and were contracted for by U.S. networks. I also understand that one of them was discontinued on the C.B.C. network.

Mr. CHARLES JENNINGS (*Controller of Broadcasting, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation*): You are referring to *Radisson*?

Mr. McGRATH: Yes.

Mr. JENNINGS: The *Last of the Mohicans* ran through its whole course on the Canadian network.

Mr. McGRATH: I did not mean to suggest Mohicans did not have its complete run, but that Radisson came. What I am mostly interested in is, how much did it cost to produce these two programs and how much was realized on the sale in the United States?

Mr. JENNINGS: First of all, Radisson, as a series, was extended beyond its original planning schedule. I forget what the original number was, though, but it was extended beyond that range, and it will run on the French network again this summer.

Mr. J. P. GILMORE (*Controller of Operations, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation*): Mr. Chairman, if I may just speak to this point, covering first the Last of the Mohicans. The Last of the Mohicans is what is known as a syndicated film production which was produced in Canada. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation did not produce this program. However, we did rent the 52 episodes of the series for showing on our English language network. The program has been sold in the United States through distribution on a similar basis to individual stations, but we did not produce the program.

Mr. McGRATH: The Mohicans?

Mr. GILMORE: Yes. May I turn now to the Radisson series? The Radisson series was produced over a period involving spring programming, and fall programming. There was a summer hiatus, where none of the episodes was shown.

The first eight or nine—I have forgotten the exact number—were shown at the tail-end of the spring schedule. Then, starting in the fall schedule, around October or November, the balance of the series to complete the 26 was shown.

At the same time, a version of the program was made for American syndication. This was sold to two or three organizations in the United States, and was shown on U.S. television, in New York and elsewhere.

There is also a deal being completed for showing in the United Kingdom. As of 8:30 this morning I could not verify the exact, final position of that deal, but I hope I will be able to report on it to you later.

As to the cost of the Radisson series, on a per episode basis it came to just over \$20,000 per episode. You must recall we produced in two languages and we produced 52 individual episodes.

The recoveries to date, if the United Kingdom deal goes through, will be approximately \$150,000.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): What if this United Kingdom deal does not go through?

Mr. GILMORE: \$146,000.

Mr. FAIRFIELD: The costs were over half a million dollars?

Mr. GILMORE: There are 52 involved in the two languages, and the cost was slightly over \$1 million total.

Mr. McGRATH: Thus far you have only realized \$150,000?

Mr. GILMORE: That is correct.

Mr. BUSHNELL: However, I think it should be noted as well, we have had the use of that program on both the French and the English networks.

Mr. GILMORE: We are repeating it in this summer's French network also.

Mr. McGRATH: Mr. Gilmore, could you tell me the Canadian talent content, if I could put it that way? Were there any American performers in this program, that came up from the United States?

Mr. GILMORE: The answer is a flat "no". As far as I can recall it was a completely Canadian production,—artists, technicians, and everything.

Mr. McGRATH: Was this program produced entirely with C.B.C. facilities, or did you call on outside film companies?

Mr. GILMORE: We called on outside film companies, and used our own production personnel and facilities also.

Mr. McGRATH: What company did you use?

Mr. GILMORE: Omega Films, in Montreal, I believe.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I wonder if Mr. Bushnell has yet been able to provide us with the U.S. imports of films? Is that available?

Mr. BUSHNELL: Not yet. It will be available shortly.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Are we ready to return to the agenda? Do I understand we are through with item 8, "Recruitment of new talent"?

Mr. TREMBLAY: No, I have a question for Mr. Ouimet.

Mr. TREMBLAY (*Interpretation*): I have a question for Mr. Ouimet. Would you please explain to me how the C.B.C. proceeds with the scripts when you want to encourage new author talent, for example. Is that done by competition or by sending out invitations?

Mr. MARCEL OUIMET (*Deputy Controller of Broadcasting, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation*): No, it is not done by competition. Actually, we are always trying to find new authors. In order to find them we have had contests with the idea of using the better scripts. You may have heard that we had on the French network some years ago a Concours Dramatique, where we had, I suppose, oh, if I remember well, something like a couple of hundred entries. Out of these 200-odd entries I believe we were able to use 20 on the air. We did discover one or two excellent writers through this contest, one of them being Guy Dufresne, who wrote for a number of years *Cap Aux Sorciers*, and is still contributing regularly to the French network schedule.

The scripts are generally submitted to the C.B.C. by people who have a particular talent to write drama or other scripts. We are constantly looking for them, because television is a very voracious medium and we never actually have enough to take care of our needs.

Mr. JENNINGS: We also try to make known as widely as possible what our requirements are, what series are required and the kind of scripts, so that aspiring writers will know what sort of market is offered by the corporation.

Mr. OUIMET: Over the years, I would say we have done pretty well in developing newcomers.

Mr. TREMBLAY (*Interpretation*): Mr. Ouimet—if I may come back to my old obsession—the fact of keeping the same old programs on television is a kind of "smoke screen" against the young authors who could provide scripts to the C.B.C. as well?

Mr. OUIMET: No, I do not actually think so; I do not believe that in television you will have the same thing that has happened in radio: I do not believe the life of a serial drama, for instance, on television will be as considerable as it is on radio. There have been some that have been running for a number of years; I believe there is one that has run for about six years. Others run for two or three years, and are cancelled either at the author's request or at the request of the C.B.C.

We are encouraging new artists all the time. It may be, Mr. Tremblay, that you have not enough time to look at television at all hours of the day; but you would know—if you looked at television in the earlier part of the day—that a number of young script writers are actually submitting, with success, scripts for serial dramas which are made for the teenage population, or teenage listeners. Eventually—I am convinced—these same authors will graduate to more important periods in the day.

There is not a wealth of authors in this country and I think, again—with the number of people we can draw from in French speaking Canada—that we are doing exceptionally well. Comparatively speaking, I think French speaking Canada has as many, if not more—I would say more—radio and television writers than our English speaking compatriots have supplied to the English network.

Mr. TREMBLAY (*Interpretation*): One final question, Mr. Ouimet. You underline the fact that a great deal of encouragement has been given to authors on television in drama, novelties and the like. Do you not think that in radio programs we have always seen the same old people over the past years, the same names, the same programs, all the various series of programs, and so on?

Mr. OUMET: It did happen; but we must not forget that a number of these authors maintained their popularity and the programs maintained their popularity, also, because of the fact that these people developed into excellent craftsmen writing for radio and for television—they have developed that craftsmanship.

You may have one of the best authors in the world and he may not be able to adapt himself to this particular medium. In fact, if you looked at a script for television, it might look like Greek to you, with all the different positions they have to put in for cameras, and so forth.

But this is a practice that is not peculiar to Canada. If you study the schedules of the last 20 years on the American networks, you will find that such programs as *Road of Life* and *Ma Perkins* run and run and run for years and years and years, again because the people making them, or writing them, were craftsmen—they could hardly be touched or competed with in this particular field. It is a tough business; there is competition but in order to break in, you have to be as good as the other fellow who is already writing.

Mr. TREMBLAY (*Interpretation*): Mr. Ouimet, does the C.B.C. take a close look at an author's work when he seems to be producing something of perhaps not the best quality? Does the C.B.C. invite the author to correct himself; does it help him in rectifying any shortcomings?

Mr. OUMET: I can tell you that we certainly do.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions on item No. 8? Shall we go on with item No. 9, Relationship with Performers Rights Society?

Mr. McCLEAVE: Mr. Chairman, there is some information being printed and it will be available when our Tuesday minutes are ready. That information is showing the exact sums paid under a variety of categories. This is a very important area. It is possible there may be savings in it—I do not know. I have a series of questions, but I wonder if they could be put over until we have the minutes of Tuesday before us?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Shall this item stand?

Agreed.

Mr. FISHER: Mr. Chairman, I have been away for some time and I just wondered if any statement was made under this heading on the plans of the C.B.C.—under the general heading, whether any statement has been made on the plans for the dominion network?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: The plans?

Mr. McCLEAVE: I think that will be G-3.

Mr. FISHER: It is in connection with the programming part of the dominion network that I wanted to ask a question. What I wanted to know was: why is it we cannot have more dominion network programming on these low-powered transmitters, and less trans-Canada?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I think that would come under G, Network relations, page 3.

Mr. BUSHNELL: Mr. Chairman, if you do not mind—I am not trying to suggest it is not a proper question at the moment—there are technical considerations, and Mr. Richardson is not here. Would you mind if we left it until he is present?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I feel, in any event, that it should come under Network relations.

Mr. BUSHNELL: He will be here for that, that is for sure.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Is it agreeable to the committee that item 9 stands? Agreed.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: My understanding is that we had decided to keep item No. 3 for today, Analysis of principles governing balance between forms of programming—drama, music, ballet, sports, talks, public affairs, religious, et cetera. Are we ready to proceed under this item?

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): If the witnesses are ready, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman, if I may make a very brief statement first, to indicate the principles which govern our planning: the first principle, of course, is that both radio and television are mass communication mediums and, therefore, programs which appeal only to the very few do not find a place in them.

In both radio and television any audience is really a very large audience, and so—as I say—programs which appeal only to a very few people just naturally do not find a way into our output. That is the first principle that governs our planning.

The second principle which governs our planning is the corporation's concept of its responsibility to supply a comprehensive program service of entertainment and information. Out of these two fields flow a great many other things. In the entertainment field our range of entertainment programs runs all the way from, you might say—in music—Bach to boogie; not very much of the little-known works of obscure composers who were mentioned at one of the earlier sittings of the committee.

In the information field it runs all the way from specialist programs, such as the farm broadcasts, the series of programs developed through the meeting at Couchiching in the summer, and Sainte Adele, special broadcasts such as Citizens Forum, Women's programs, commentaries, school broadcasts, general talks programs, information on international affairs, and so on.

So out of that second group, as I say, with our conception of our responsibility to put out a wholly comprehensive information and entertainment service in television and radio, there has developed this wide range of programming over the years in radio—and developing now in television—and patterned in such a way, we hope, that at appropriate times, through regional programming, we are serving various sections of the community in various parts of the country.

In carrying this out, we make a pretty continuing assessment. Every six months we do a statistical analysis of the make-up of the schedules, and every three months—well beforehand—we fasten down the program service as closely as we can in the kind of business we are in. We fasten down the output for a quarter, and we try to fasten down that output for a quarter not later than a couple of months before the beginning of that quarter.

This is no only one way of assessing the output in detail for that period but, of course, it is also brought about by the necessity of careful close budgeting considerations.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have given a general sort of statement there of the principles that govern us. I do not know whether you would like me to touch on any statistics, any breakdowns. Mr. Trainor, I think, has some information which he could supply, and I have also.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Mr. Chairman, perhaps we might come to the statistics as another question which has direct reference to a particular area. I wonder if I could ask this question? I realize that we have dealt with this subject at a previous meeting, but I wonder if I could obtain from Mr. Jennings exactly what individual—if any individual—or what team of individuals is responsible for maintaining this delicate balance? I am thinking, too, of the balance with respect to Canadian content. Where is this decision, basically, made; is it made by an individual, or by a group?

Mr. JENNINGS: It is actually made by a planning group, in Montreal for the French network; and at the operating centre, for the English networks, in Toronto.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I do not wish to have names; but would you give me an idea of what this group—for example, at Toronto—consists of.

Mr. JENNINGS: The group at Toronto consists of what we call national supervisors, who carry out specialist planning and breaking down over a fairly wide range—music, talks, public affairs, news, school broadcasts, farm and fisheries, incidental broadcasts, variety, features, religious broadcasts. I may have missed a couple. The same pattern is followed in the French network. Their work is brought together by the director of the television network or of the radio network.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Does the director invariably have the right of veto to determine whether or not a particular program, in his opinion, should be aired?

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not think it is as arbitrary as the right to veto. It all comes out, really, in a sort of discussion—because you will realize that, with any particular radio program, ten people will have ten views about it.

It really emerges as a decision under the chairmanship of the network director, who obviously must make a decision. It may be referred to me, and I may refer to Mr. Bushnell.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): This group, I understand, would probably have some tools to work with in order to make their assessment of that? I mean, they would, conceivably, use the research bureau to determine whether or not they were retaining the correct balance; is that a fair statement?

Mr. JENNINGS: I think this is correct; but I would say that all of these specialist people are maintaining the closest liaison with organizations and individuals throughout the country who are interested in the particular field for which they are responsible.

The farm and fisheries department maintains very close connection with the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, and with all the provincial departments. That extends through all the specialist departments, that kind of outside liaison, consultation, which is going on all the time.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Finally, we know, of course, that private radio stations, individually, in locales will carry out a particular type of programming, for which they are answerable to the B.B.C. to determine whether they are living up to the terms of their licence. Does the C.B.C. concern itself—in order to determine the national balance—with what the private broadcaster is doing, to determine whether the balance is always in correct proportion? Otherwise, is there any relationship in any of the surveys you make as to what the private broadcaster is doing, in relation to your own service, or your own programming?

Mr. JENNINGS: We have that information, of course; but it would be practically an impossible thing to do. We try to plan our service as a comprehensive service, and across the country it would be impossible to—

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I certainly agree with that. It was not quite what I meant. You will see—as an example—C.B.C. in a particular area may—if I may take the western division, perhaps—be providing a concentration of a particular type of program; and I have found that there is—even between private broadcasters in east and west—rather an extraordinary variation in their programming. I am just wondering if there is any inter-relationship at all between the C.B.C. and the private broadcaster in their programming habits, and so on.

Mr. JENNINGS: No, I cannot say that there is, in that sense, a continual planning, with the idea of C.B.C. supplying something opposite private stations. But on television for the last three years we have developed—stemming out of our affiliates meetings, which we attend twice a year, covering all the television station affiliates—a programming advisory committee, which is made up of the C.B.C. and private stations, where we discuss the whole program picture. We have found that very useful, and I believe the private affiliates have also found it very useful.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I do not think it is a responsibility of the C.B.C., and I am not suggesting it is; but I think an inter-relationship has to be established somehow, and you do have a man specifically concerned with the relationship with private broadcasters?

Mr. JENNINGS: That is correct.

Mr. FAIRFIELD: Mr. Chairman, may Mr. Jennings give us a rough breakdown on a percentage basis, statistically, of how much drama there is, how much sport per week, and so on?

Mr. JENNINGS: I could. I could give you a general one first. I think our annual report has that breakdown in the centre section. There was this exhibit that we put in, Dr. Fairfield. First of all, perhaps I could give you a general breakdown of a sample week in the winter of 1957-58.

Mr. FISHER: Radio or television?

Mr. JENNINGS: This is television. This is a percentage of network hours. In the area that we call predominantly entertainment, under that we have what we call general entertainment, creative arts and sports. The percentage of the network—on the English network—was 64 per cent. It was 74 per cent on the French network. That is an average of 70 per cent for the two.

In the area that we call predominantly information—news and weather, 6 per cent; farm and fisheries, one per cent—I am giving you the English—household and its activities, 2 per cent; science and nature, 2 per cent; foreign information, 3 per cent.

Then, predominantly idea or opinion—another general area; Canadian activities and heritage, 2 per cent; religious, 2 per cent; school and other youth education, 2 per cent; political and other controversial public affairs, 4 per cent; social and human relations, one per cent.

I will go on to give you program examples. In the general entertainment area, during that particular week we would identify such programs as Cross-Canada Hit Parade, Front Page Challenge, G.M. Television Theatre, Hidden Pages, Hobby Corner, children's programs, Juliette, Maggie Muggins—children's program—On Camera, Open House, Plouffe Family, and so on.

Under the area of creative arts we identify such programs as Open House, C.B.C. Folios and Concert Hour. In sports, the hockey, wrestling, King Whyte Show, bowling, sports view and things like that.

Mr. BUSHNELL: I think on page 18 of the annual report for 1957-58 you get a breakdown percentage-wise for television, English; and radio, French—and the classification of the various programs.

Mr. FISHER: Is it the assumption—since television has become sort of a major interest in your programming—that your radio programming has moved to what you might call a heavier line and it actually has more body to it, in terms of, say, cultural programs?

Mr. JENNINGS: The two major trends, I would think, are increased concentration on daytime programming. The audience at night—we have not a great deal of television throughout the day yet—swings pretty heavily to television viewing. So we have some of our largest audiences for radio during the day time. This has meant a rather interesting new kind of operation, what we call “double exposure”.

We have now made arrangements with artists and musicians to do a repeat in the daytime of a program heard at night. We take two cracks at it, and sometimes the program, which may be live on the daytime show and repeated at night, has a much larger audience—or, nearly always, has a much larger audience at night. We have attempted to introduce a certain amount of more serious programming on the radio. We have found there is an appetite for this and a demand for it.

Mr. FISHER: It is not fair to comment on that. On the educational side of it, we have the constitutional principle in so far as education is concerned, but I continue to hear great disappointment expressed by teachers over the fact that you have not moved as quickly as many of them would like, in both radio and television, in extending educational programs. Is that because of lack of cooperation with the departments of education, or do you have to wait for them to take the initiative?

Mr. JENNINGS: We have to wait for them to take the initiative, but by and large—you are speaking of school broadcasting?

Mr. FISHER: Yes.

Mr. JENNINGS: With regard to school broadcasting we have the National Advisory Council on School broadcasting—which has been in existence for 15 or 16 years, at least, I would think—which guides and advises the Corporation in its activities in School broadcasting.

Quite frankly, so far as television is concerned, we have done a couple of experimental series so far, and we have not yet settled down to any regular series. We have done two experimental network series, and there have been two local series, one in Halifax and one in Winnipeg.

I should say, the National Advisory Council on school broadcasting asked all the provinces—it is made up of provincial representatives—not to engage single-handed in experiments in school broadcasting without consulting and clearing them with the national council first, so there would be as much cohesion and general knowledge and experience put into each experiment as possible. We intend to do again an experiment in the near future.

Mr. FISHER: Do you have any way of checking on experiments in Texas, Cincinnati and places like that, where it is pushed to quite a degree?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, we are quite well aware of what is going on in educational programming in the United States and Britain.

Mr. FISHER: Have you any conception of the cost picture, and whether it is a field into which you could move, or is it something in which the provincial authorities are going to have to put up quite a bit of money and talent?

Mr. JENNINGS: In television as compared with radio it is a horse of a different colour. In radio we provide facilities for provincial authorities to do the programs themselves. We supply the facilities, production, and so on.

When you get into television school broadcasting the supply of the facilities is a much more expensive and a much more complicated thing than the rather simple thing it is on radio. We have not yet settled on any formula of what we could supply. We have not settled firmly on any formula.

Mr. FISHER: I do not want to be unkind, but does this not suggest lack of initiative, in light of the fact that in other countries things have been pushed further, and there is more extensive experimental work completed?

Mr. JENNINGS: I would say, Mr. Fisher, that we have got a good deal to learn yet about just how effective television broadcasting is for schools. There are all sorts of theories about school broadcasting and television. There is the so-called master teacher theory, in which you have a person teaching a lesson and the schools are all linked by television reception. I have heard this theory attacked very vigorously. You have these theories. As in radio, a television program is something which really enriches. It is just a matter of the means of enriching what the teacher himself or herself can do in the classroom. We are not clear nor are educational authorities clear, as to which way we should go yet.

I do not think we are holding back. There is the consideration in this country, because of the constitutional position, that the lead must, in many cases be given to us.

Mr. FISHER: Have you any indication, say, from Ontario west, that you could get the kind of cooperation that would lead to a network that would be able to provide television programming in the daytime or in the morning hours?

Mr. JENNINGS: I could not say precisely. I believe there are different levels of enthusiasm as between different provinces, as to the value of going into school broadcasting on television.

The VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Smith?

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Mr. Jennings, is this problem of maintaining this balance—which, I see, is one of your most difficult objective problems—something you are continually concerned with?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, it is a continuing problem and a difficult problem, but it is not the sort of problem you can solve with any sort of precise formula. We cannot at any time be sure that the percentage of ballet programs being put on television is the right amount of ballet you want. It is a fairly pragmatic process which goes on all the time, by an assessment of outside opinion. As far as ballet is concerned I would say that in this country there has been an increased interest in the last five or six years, with the Winnipeg Ballet, the National Ballet of Toronto and the Grands Ballets Canadiens in Montreal.

This all helps to guide our thinking.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): It would be fair to say, though, that naturally you are reasonably satisfied the balance is correct, that it is a proper balance you have? That would be a fair question?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, I suppose you could say we are reasonably satisfied. We are always at it.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I wonder if there is any consistency in this. Perhaps this is the flexible aspect. Mr. Pratt, when discussing this matter with Mr. Bushnell, I think drew from Mr. Bushnell the concession we are

over-weighted right now in the field of westerns. Is that a localized situation, or a temporary situation? Are you still happy with the balance in respect of this one instance?

Mr. BUSHNELL: As, I suppose, I started that, I would like to say that when I took a look at the schedule afterwards I was reminded by my colleagues we did not have as many as I thought we probably had.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): How many did you think we had?

Mr. BUSHNELL: When I made that answer I was thinking in terms not only of the syndicated films—Gunsmoke and Have Gun Will Travel—but a number of the feature films we show. But as far as syndicated film is concerned, I think we have three or four in the week.

I notice too—and here is where you get caught out—we have Disneyland. We have that Disney show approximately 39 to 52 weeks. The first thing you know is they run a series of westerns slap bang in the middle of it.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): We are going off into the content area. I wish to raise that later. I suggest that you run many of these shows that have appeal to youngsters when many of them are in bed, and consequently they see another type which is not suitable for them.

But may we come back to this question of Canadian content? Perhaps we could clear up one point. You are not unhappy about the fact we have too many westerns? You think it is a pretty good balance?

Mr. BUSHNELL: Yes, I think so.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think so too.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I suggest to you the possibility this question of Canadian content is also part of this problem of maintaining a balance, is it not? It is the same board that maintains this Canadian content, they determine the balance? Again, there is no fixed formula?

Mr. JENNINGS: We start off with a balance of about 50 per cent on our stations and on the network. On the network we have divided it now 60-40, I think I am correct in saying this. The intention all the time in the planning, and with the funds at our disposal, is to try to increase the Canadian content.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Would I be correct in assuming the \$19 million you pay out in talent fees, that proportion would be roughly the same; in other words, 60 per cent of that would be for Canadians? It would be higher too, would it not?

Mr. BUSHNELL: I think it would be higher than that, because the American product, if you like, the imported product, costs less than the cost of almost any decent sized Canadian product. For example, you can buy all the syndicated film in the world. There are hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of products that can be bought in the United States for as little as \$1,500 per half hour episode. In Canada some of them run to \$4,500 or \$4,800; but you cannot put on a Canadian show of any size for that amount of money, particularly if you are using quite a large number of Canadian performers.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): What do we really mean when we are talking about Canadian content? We are talking purely about Canadian performers, Canadian production and Canadian cast?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, and those talent fees you mentioned, practically 100 per cent of those would be to Canadian performers.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Roughly the \$19 million then?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): This Canadian content, regarding Cross Canada Hit Parade, that is Canadian talent or American talent?

Mr. JENNINGS: Canadian talent, with the occasional American guest. We cannot buck the hits.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): You do not have any concern that, perhaps, the problem of maintaining this 60-40 balance, which you state you wish to see go even higher—as a principle that is a very excellent one—but you are not concerned, in an attempt to maintain this, that quality does not perhaps suffer a little bit, and if you are going to increase Canadian content the quality of your total product is not in jeopardy?

Mr. JENNINGS: I think you will remember we discussed that briefly at an earlier meeting.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I had an emphatic “no” then.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think we have to say this: say, in comedy and variety shows, I do not think, as yet, we have the sort of polish and slick techniques, knowledge or ability of some of the Americans. But it is a field in which there is a great deal of American talent, and I think our experience, by getting into these things, is invaluable. For instance, I think our variety shows over the last four years have improved very much indeed.

I would say this Cross Canada Hit Parade we have put on has a great deal more ingenuity and polish than the American shows.

Mr. BUSHNELL: So much so they stole our producer.

Mr. JENNINGS: That is a matter of development through survey.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): They show some signs of indicating greater popular appeal than they did a year ago?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): These are the ones that are basically Canadian in content?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. For example, Front Page Challenge, it started rather slowly, but has gone up very rapidly, and has a very very large audience now. But audiences generally are increasing.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): General Motors Presents, is that true of it as well?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, I would think so quite definitely, without checking the figures.

Mr. OUMET: Mr. Chairman, I think, if we have confidence in ourselves, and since it can be done on the French network, where the quality of the programs is just as good as on the English network, we should also be able to maintain the excellent quality of Canadian produced programs in the English language. It is done on the French network; why cannot it be done on the English network as well?

Mr. JENNINGS: We also have a pretty good record—and this is an immodest statement—of achievement over the years in the development of the radio service. We found talent, resources and people who were able to plan and bring that to the programs here. I think we have sufficient confidence that we can do the same thing in television.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Frankly, my Canadian ego is such that I would like to see complete Canadian content, but I am often concerned, as a viewer, that this attempt to maintain the Canadian identity means that we are inclined to sacrifice quality, and this is the purpose of my asking you these questions.

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not think so.

The VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Tremblay, and then Mr. Fisher.

Mr. TREMBLAY (*Interpretation*): Mr. Ouimet, you gave us, the other day, some data of what are known as educational programs. Have there yet been on the French radio any strictly educational programs, in the sense we understand them in Quebec; that is to say, not just programs for adults?

Mr. OUIMET: We have never had on the French networks what is called in English a school broadcast. What we have on the French networks are programs designed according to the definition which you can find, I believe, on page 6 of the Massey report, programs which make a difference between—I would like here to speak French—l'Éducation académique et l'Éducation extra-scolaire.

Mr. TREMBLAY (*In French not interpreted*).

The INTERPRETER: Mr. Ouimet, continuing in French, said: at this point I prefer to continue in French. The difference involved is that between academic and extra-scholastic or post-scholastic education.

Mr. Tremblay then said: Mr. Ouimet, to what philosophical category, as you just indicated, belonged the program Radio-Collège?

Mr. OUIMET: Radio-Collège, for a number of years, was of a cultural nature, as a general rule. In fact, we have used on Radio-Collège some of the classical plays and some of the most advanced modern plays which would not have been scheduled on our normal sponsored drama productions, because they were of such a level that they would appeal, as a general rule, to the cultured individual most and less to the mass.

So, I would say that Radio-Collège would fit rather in the category of what you would call éducation extra-scolaire.

Mr. TREMBLAY (*Interpretation*): Well, Mr. Ouimet, was not this program aimed rather at college students, students who are still in what you call the academic stage?

Mr. OUIMET: If you understand "college students" to mean University students, to a certain extent. But don't you, Mr. Tremblay, consider the arts course of the province of Quebec as the equivalent of a university course in some of our English-speaking universities in Canada? I would say it was designed not only for advanced students, but also for general distribution to the adults who happened to be at home at the particular time when the broadcasts were being carried.

Some of the colleges in those days had recording machines. They would not listen generally to them in class; but a proportion had recording machines and they would record some of the productions and then play them to the students at later hours.

It was also one of the recommendations of the Massey Commission that because of the level of these broadcasts, which you may call educational, they should be scheduled at a better time. Then around 1951 or 1952, just before the advent of television, we did move a number of Radio-Collège broadcasts to a night spot in the schedule and dropped the title Radio-Collège from that day on. We did this because these programs were to be carried at 8.00 o'clock, and it was felt, because of their quality that in order to reach a larger audience, they should be scheduled at a better time.

Mr. TREMBLAY (*Interpretation*): Mr. Ouimet, was it not proposed also to put this program, Radio-Collège, on television under that name, or under another name?

Mr. OUMET: No, I do not believe we would bring it back as such, under the name Radio-Collège. What we do on television is this: we have a lot of things on television that are equivalent to what used to be done on Radio-Collège (radio), but we considered, as we have an over-all—and I mentioned this the other day—service—actually, it is the Service des émissions éducatives et des affaires publiques, which is responsible for talks, public affairs broadcasts and also cultural programs; actually we considered doing on television some of the broadcasts which we do on radio. For instance, I would say that a program like “L’heure du Concert”, in radio days would have fitted the Radio-Collège schedule. We dropped the title Radio-Collège because we wanted to get a larger audience. I remember when we used to go on the air with “Radio-Collège présents” . . . there was a certain reluctance on a certain part of the audience. They would feel that there was going to be some kind of teaching taking place or something like that, and would turn off the set. We dropped the title and we found out immediately—and I was responsible for it being dropped—that the audience increased; and educational broadcasts in the province of Quebec today have an extraordinary acceptance, especially if we take into account the survey conducted in the last few months by L’Institut Canadien d’éducation des adultes, the results of which have been published in newspapers during the last few days.

Mr. TREMBLAY (*Interpretation*): Well, Mr. Ouimet, what you are referring to, namely this inquiry of the Canadian Institute of Adults, deals really with culture in general, and what I am particularly interested in knowing is the policy of the C.B.C. in regard to strictly academic education, that is, covering the three levels, primary, secondary and upper; so I would like to know if, during the past two or three years, there have been exchanges between the council of public instruction or public education, the Federation of Classical Colleges and the universities of Quebec whereby they have asked that arrangements be entered into with a view to putting on the air strictly educational programs in the sense in which we understand them in the province of Quebec, and that is the same sense as that implied in the spirit of the British North America Act.

Mr. OUMET: There have been a number of informal contacts made over the years. The situation concerning school broadcasts in Quebec was defined quite clearly in a statement which the former general manager of the C.B.C., Dr. Frigon, gave to the press in 1949. The situation has not changed very radically since. If you are interested I can give you the gist of this statement later on. The latest contact made with the authorities of the province of Quebec in the field of education dates back to September, 1955, at which time the Director of the French networks, Mr. Lamarche, saw the Superintendent of education, Mr. Désaulniers, of the government of the province of Quebec.

I have here a report which I would like to read into the minutes:

(*Translation*):

The interview was held in a cordial spirit. The superintendent in no way committed himself and left no possibility of a solution in sight. He left it to be understood that he could see several objections which could be received from the constitutional point of view of the provinces. The interview had no concrete result, and there was no follow-up.

This is a report which followed a letter which was sent to the superintendent on September 23, 1955, confirming the interview which had taken place.

As the former general manager of the C.B.C. said in 1949, the C.B.C. has always been open to cooperation with the educational authorities of the province of Quebec in order to enter into such broadcasts as school broadcasts on the same basis as we are doing with the provincial authorities of other provinces.

Mr. TREMBLAY (*Interpretation*): Mr. Ouimet, I have one final question. Would the C.B.C. expect that the provincial educational bodies should prepare these educational programs? As I said a moment ago, this would be subject to technical considerations such as scheduling, and I am speaking of C.B.C. programs for both television and radio.

Mr. OUIMET (*Interpretation*): Mr. Chairman, as I just said, the position of the C.B.C. in this respect was defined very clearly by the former general manager of the C.B.C. and I think I should read the statement that he made in 1951, which is a practical summary of the situation existing then, and which still applies in 1959. The following is the statement.

(*Sight translation*): We do not believe that it is up to the C.B.C. to decide upon educational matters on the radio and what they should teach. Such a decision is one for the regional or local school authorities. All we do is to contribute by our technical and financial facilities in making radio education as effective as possible where the competent authorities desire to establish this.

In all the provinces, with the exception of the French speaking schools in the province of Quebec, they have radio educational programs and, with this in mind, 6,754 schools received free in the period 1949 to 1950 licences for the use of receiving apparatus. It is estimated that during this same year 430,000 pupils benefited from radio education. Naturally, this does not take account of an even greater number of adults who listened at home.

The provincial authorities prepare the course and pay for the scripts and those who take part in the programs. The C.B.C. undertakes production of the programs and their broadcasting over the various network stations. Thus, as regards the type of teaching, only the local or regional scholastic educational authorities are responsible. This type of program is broadcast by the regional networks.

The C.B.C. also puts out educational programs of general interest, but the subjects dealt with and the very nature of the program are under the absolute control of a council committee—or perhaps that means advisory board—on which all the provinces are represented. These programs are broadcast by the trans-Canada network which serves all the provinces. The C.B.C. has always declared it is ready to assist the competent authorities which call upon it for assistance in introducing educational broadcasts for their classes.

Furthermore, the educational programs on the radio existed in a number of provinces before the creation or the setting up of the C.B.C. and this is a clear indication that the C.B.C. did not, so to speak, impose conditions in the field of teaching. Quite to the contrary, all they did was to follow up those who believe that the radio is a modern and effective educational device.

This is signed by Mr. Augustin Frigon, director general of the C.B.C. and is dated at Montreal on March 27, 1951.

Mr. OUMET: Mr. Chairman, I should say, for the benefit of the committee, that the general manager of the C.B.C., when he made that statement, had been for a number of years president of the corporation of L'École Polytechnique of Montreal, and as such was sitting on the Conseil de l'Instruction Publique of the province of Quebec.

Mr. TREMBLAY (*Interpretation*): Mr. Chairman, as you know, there was a judgment of the privy council as regards federal intervention in this field and, considering the cultural aspects of the C.B.C., should this not be considered as the reason for the hesitation of some provinces as regards C.B.C.'s educational initiatives?

Mr. TREMBLAY: Excuse me. (*Interpretation*): Mr. Chairman, that was not exactly what I said. What I said was as follows: There was a judgment of the privy council, allowing the federal government to occupy the field of broadcasting for educational purposes; but, as step by step the C.B.C. occupied at one and the same time the field of information and of culture and of education, do we not see, in this initiative of the C.B.C., the reason for the hesitation of some provinces, as regards the initiative of the C.B.C., in educational matters?

The VICE CHAIRMAN: I do not think the witness should be called upon to answer this. I do not know the view of the committee; but this is a matter of opinion—it is not a matter of fact.

Mr. TREMBLAY: No—I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is a matter of fact. We have to know the policy of C.B.C. about programming, in the broad sense.

The VICE CHAIRMAN: The witness is not obliged to answer. He may answer, if he wishes.

Mr. SMITH (*Simcoe North*): Mr. Chairman, I do not think the witness could possibly know why some provinces have, or have not, participated in these broadcasts. It is a matter that should be directed to the provincial departments, if some provincial educational departments were called.

The VICE CHAIRMAN: That is my view.

Mr. OUMET: This may be, Mr. Chairman; but the only thing I know is that I have this letter of September 23, 1955, written—as I said earlier—to the superintendent of the Department of Education in Quebec, which states very clearly that we are ready to cooperate fully. We never received an answer to that letter. Why the decision was taken negatively, I do not know. But we are, and—I repeat—we shall always be ready to cooperate fully in this particular field.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask two very short questions.

The VICE CHAIRMAN: One moment. If it is on the same subject, all right; but if it is not on the same subject, would you mind delaying it.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): No, it is not.

The VICE CHAIRMAN: Very well. Mr. Fisher has a question.

Mr. FISHER: Originally, Mr. Bushnell, when the Canadian government got into broadcasting, was it not a fact that all the provinces had to agree to the situation before you went ahead?

Mr. BUSHNELL: Yes.

Mr. FISHER: So that at that time there was a decision taken by all the provinces that the federal government should go into this field, in the programming sense; is that true?

Mr. TREMBLAY: No.

Mr. JENNING: Actually, they came to us individually, in the beginning, and I think, before the organization of the C.R.B.C. or the C.B.C. there was school broadcasting being done provincially in British Columbia and, I think, in Nova Scotia.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak on this point of order which was brought upon the question of Mr. Tremblay. I would like to point out that it is for the chairman to make a decision on questions by any member here: he does not need the help of any self-appointed president or chairman. Let the chairman decide whether or not the question is pertinent.

The VICE CHAIRMAN: I gave my views.

Mr. JOHNSON: It is not for the committee to decide. We are entitled to ask questions in this committee, and we do not intend to suffer because other members bring up points of order to delay the proceedings.

Mr. TREMBLAY: On this point of order, Mr. Chairman (*Interpretation*): Mr. Chairman, I think there is no reason for us to make "a storm in a teacup" of such a simple question. I put the question, which perhaps required an opinion. Mr. Ouimet gave a satisfactory answer. He said, "perhaps", and I am satisfied and do not wish to pursue the matter any further.

Mr. FISHER: Mr. Chairman, may I carry along the line that I was on? Has there been any discussion within the C.B.C. of any certain regions turning back to certain provincial authorities the broadcasting rights?

Mr. BUSHNELL: Not that I am aware of, Mr. Fisher.

Mr. FISHER: Has there been any consideration given—this is a point I brought up many meetings ago—to the problem, if a province decides to introduce censorship of television?

Mr. BUSHNELL: I do not quite follow you there: I am a little dense this morning.

Mr. FISHER: Supposing a province decides it is going to introduce censorship of television programs—it seems to have the constitutional right: there has even been some discussion on it in one province—what does that raise for the C.B.C.?

Mr. BUSHNELL: I do not know what it would raise for the C.B.C. It is rather, I should think, an academic question that I do not think has arisen.

Mr. FISHER: The point I want to get clear is:—the whole tenor of the questions today confirms that you have no constitutional authority in the programming and broadcasting field, if a provincial authority decides to step in and take an active role; is that not true?

Mr. BUSHNELL: I do not think I am competent to answer that question now; I would like to get some legal advice on that point.

SMITH (*Calgary South*): Surely it is a question for the B.B.G.?

Mr. McCLEAVE (*Interpretation*): Mr. Chairman, I have another question in the French language, and this regards the French networks. Have you, on those networks, any programs for teaching English, such as on the English networks here have programs for teaching French?

Mr. OUMET: On the stations situated in the province of Quebec, I would say "No". But, in cooperation with the government of New Brunswick, we

do put on French school broadcasts, and this is one of the subjects which is being regularly taught on the school broadcasts of the province of New Brunswick. French is being taught for the benefit of the English speaking population, and English is being taught for the benefit of the French speaking population.

The VICE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, the only time we could meet again today would be tonight.

Mr. JOHNSON: I do not think we should meet tonight.

Mr. SMITH (*Simcoe North*): Not tonight.

Mr. JOHNSON: Would we get a quorum for a meeting tonight?

The VICE CHAIRMAN: That might be the source of the difficulty, I understand some people will be watching television and listening to radio tonight.

Mr. JOHNSON: We all know the results already; we do not need to watch it.

The VICE CHAIRMAN: What is the wish of the committee—next Tuesday?

Agreed.

THE FOLLOWING IS THE TEXT OF THAT PART OF THE
COMMITTEE'S PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED IN
THE FRENCH LANGUAGE

ON TROUVERA CI-DESSOUS LE TEXTE DE LA PARTIE DES DÉLIBÉRATIONS
DU COMITÉ QUI S'EST DÉROULÉE EN FRANÇAIS

(Page No. 394)

M. TREMBLAY: Monsieur le président, je voudrais faire remarquer que je ne suis pas surpris qu'on ne nous donne pas les détails que j'ai demandés au sujet du programme "Pour elle", mais je ne considère pas moins qu'il aurait été bien important d'avoir ces détails.

* * *

(Page No. 396)

M. TREMBLAY: Monsieur Ouimet, pouvez-vous m'expliquer comment la société Radio-Canada procède dans le choix des textes, lorsqu'il s'agit de nouveaux auteurs de textes? Est-ce que vous procédez par voie de concours, est-ce que vous faites des invitations?

* * *

M. TREMBLAY: Monsieur Ouimet, ne pensez-vous pas, revenant à ma vieille obsession, que le fait de maintenir pendant longtemps les mêmes programmes à la télévision est une espèce d'écran de fumée qui peut nuire à ces jeunes auteurs qui pourraient fournir des textes à Radio-Canada?

* * *

(Page No. 397)

M. TREMBLAY:

Une dernière question. Vous avez souligné le fait qu'on avait donné beaucoup d'encouragement aux jeunes auteurs à la télévision, à l'occasion de nouveautés dramatiques, etc. Ne pensez-vous pas qu'à Radio-Canada ce sont toujours les mêmes gens qui ont les continuités? Depuis plusieurs années, ce sont les mêmes séries de programmes savon, etc.

* * *

M. TREMBLAY:

Maintenant, M. Ouimet, est-ce que la société Radio-Canada, lorsqu'un auteur lui paraît échoir un tant soit peu, est-ce que la société Radio-Canada le semonce et l'invite à se corriger?

* * *

(Page No. 405)

M. TREMBLAY:

Monsieur Ouimet, vous avez donné, l'autre jour, quelques renseignements au sujet de ce que l'on appelle les programmes éducationnels. Pourriez-vous me dire s'il y a déjà eu, au réseau français de Radio-Canada, des programmes strictement éducationnels, dans le sens que nous l'entendons dans le Québec, c'est-à-dire pas simplement des programmes qui s'adressent aux adultes?

* * *

(Page No. 405)

M. TREMBLAY:

A quelle catégorie appartenait le programme "Radio-Collège"?

* * *

M. TREMBLAY:

Mais, monsieur Ouimet, est-ce que ce programme ne s'adressait pas davantage aux étudiants des collèges, aux étudiants qui en sont encore au stade de ce que vous appelez, vous, l'éducation académique?

* * *

M. TREMBLAY:

Monsieur Ouimet, ce programme "Radio-Collège", est-ce qu'on ne s'était pas proposé de le réaliser à la télévision également, sous ce nom ou sous un autre?

* * *

(Page No. 406)

M. TREMBLAY:

Monsieur Ouimet, ce à quoi vous faites allusion, c'est cette enquête sur l'éducation des adultes. Je réfère plutôt à des programmes d'ordre culturel, en général.

Ce qui m'intéresse, c'est de savoir exactement quelle est la politique de Radio-Canada à l'endroit des programmes d'éducation strictement académique, c'est-à-dire couvrant les trois niveaux du primaire, du secondaire et du supérieur.

Je voudrais savoir . . . je vais vous demander ceci: Est-ce que, depuis deux ou trois ans, il y a eu des échanges entre le Conseil de l'instruction publique et la Fédération des collèges classiques et les universités du Québec demandant des programmes, c'est-à-dire pour conclure les arrangements dans le but de mettre au programme des émissions strictement éducatives, au sens où nous l'entendons dans le Québec, c'est-à-dire le sens de l'Acte de l'Amérique du nord britannique?

* * *

M. OUMET: Le surintendant ne s'est aucunement prononcé, il n'a laissé entrevoir aucune possibilité de solution; il a plutôt laissé entendre qu'il entrevoyait plusieurs objections du point de vue de la constitution provinciale et qu'il consulterait qui de droit. L'entrevue n'a donné aucun résultat concret et n'a pas eu de suite.

* * *

(Page No. 407)

M. TREMBLAY: Une dernière question. Est-ce que Radio-Canada, à l'exception des arrangements strictement techniques, est-ce que Radio-Canada consentirait à ce que des organismes provinciaux d'éducation élaborent des programmes éducatifs et, comme je le disais tout à l'heure, à l'exception des arrangements techniques et des questions d'horaires, est-ce que Radio-Canada consentirait à ce que des organismes provinciaux préparent ces programmes pour leur mise en ondes sur les ondes de Radio-Canada, à la télévision ou à la radio?

* * *

M. OUMET: Monsieur le président, la position de Radio-Canada, dans ce domaine, comme je l'ai indiqué tout à l'heure, a été définie très clairement par l'ancien directeur général de la société Radio-Canada, M. Augustin Frigon.

Je crois qu'à ce point je devrais lire la déclaration qu'il avait faite en 1949 et qui résume, à toute fin pratique, la position de Radio-Canada en 1949 et, dix ans plus tard, en 1959. Voici:

Nous ne croyons pas qu'il soit du ressort de la société Radio-Canada de décider où doit être organisée la radio-scolaire et ce qu'elle doit enseigner; une telle décision appartient aux autorités scolaires locales ou régionales. Nous ne faisons que contribuer par nos moyens techniques et financiers à rendre la radio-scolaire le plus efficace possible là où les autorités compétentes désirent l'établir.

Toutes les provinces, à l'exception des écoles de langue française de Québec, ont leur radio-scolaire. Dans ce but, 6,764 écoles reçurent gratuitement, en 1949-50, des permis pour l'usage d'appareils de réception. On estime qu'au cours de cette même année 430,000 élèves ont bénéficié de la radio-scolaire. Naturellement, ceci ne tient pas compte d'un nombre encore plus grand d'adultes qui écoutent à la maison.

Les autorités provinciales préparent les cours et paient les manuscrits et ceux qui participent aux programmes. La société Radio-Canada se charge de la production des programmes et de leur radiodiffusion sur les postes des réseaux. Donc, pour ce qui est de la nature de l'enseignement, seules les autorités scolaires locales sont responsables; cette catégorie de programmes est diffusée par des réseaux régionaux. Radio-Canada émet aussi des programmes scolaires d'intérêt national, mais les sujets traités et la nature même des programmes sont sous le contrôle absolu d'un comité-conseil sur lequel toutes les provinces sont représentées; ces programmes sont diffusés par le réseau Trans-Canada qui dessert toutes les provinces.

Ici, je veux passer une partie de la déclaration qui a trait à certains points qui concernent plus strictement les écoles, pour terminer avec la déclaration de M. Frigon à ce moment-là. Et je continue:

La Société s'est toujours déclarée prête à aider les autorités compétentes qui sollicitent son appui pour l'introduction de la radio-scolaire dans leurs classes. D'ailleurs, la radio-scolaire existait dans certaines provinces avant que ne fut fondée la société Radio-Canada, ce qui indique bien que cette Société ne s'est pas imposée dans le domaine de l'enseignement; bien au contraire, elle n'a fait que seconder ceux qui croient voir dans la radio une méthode pédagogique moderne efficace.

* * *

(Page No. 408)

M. TREMBLAY: Vous savez qu'il y a eu un jugement du conseil privé, permettant aux autorités fédérales d'occuper dans le domaine des ondes pour des fins d'information. Étant donné que la société Radio-Canada a, en même temps que le domaine de l'information, occupé progressivement celui de la culture et de l'éducation, est-ce qu'on ne pourrait pas voir là la raison de cette réticence que certaines provinces opposent aux initiatives de Radio-Canada en matière d'éducation?

* * *

M. TREMBLAY: Non, ce n'est pas exactement cela que j'ai dit. J'ai dit qu'il y a eu un jugement du conseil privé permettant aux autorités d'occuper dans le domaine des ondes pour des fins d'information, et j'ai ajouté que, étant donné que la société Radio-Canada a, en même temps, que le domaine de l'information, occupé progressivement celui de la culture et de l'éducation, est-ce qu'on ne pourrait pas voir là la raison de cette réticence qu'ont certaines provinces en regard des initiatives de Radio-Canada en matière d'éducation?

* * *

(Page No. 409)

M. TREMBLAY: Je pense qu'il n'y a pas de raison de faire du drame sur un sujet aussi simple. J'ai posé une question qui peut-être demandait une opinion. M. Ouimet m'a donné une réponse satisfaisante. Il m'a dit: Peut-être. Je suis satisfait, je n'en exige pas davantage.

* * *

(Page No. 409)

M. McCLEAVE: Monsieur le président, une autre question en français. Sur le réseau français, avez-vous des programmes où l'on enseigne l'anglais, comme sur les réseaux anglais nous en avons où l'on enseigne le français?

